



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/803,387	03/09/2001	Tomas Roztocil	10432/60	7392
1333	7590	06/01/2005	EXAMINER	
PATENT LEGAL STAFF EASTMAN KODAK COMPANY 343 STATE STREET ROCHESTER, NY 14650-2201			THAI, CUONG T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2173	

DATE MAILED: 06/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/803,387	ROZTOCIL ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	CUONG T. THAI	2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 January 2005.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

FINAL ACTION

1. This action is responsive to Amendment filed on Jan/07/2005.
2. Claims 1-40 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
4. Claims 1-2, 4-5, 19, 21, 23-24 and 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants submitted IDS issued to Tokin et al. (USPN: 6,134,568) hereinafter Tokin in view of Parker et al. (USPN: 6,441,919) hereinafter Parker.

As per claims 1 (system), 19 (method), and 38 (system); Tokin discloses a method of an interface, implemented in a computer, for controlling a printer to print a document having multiple pages is taught by Tokin as the technique of various pages of the graphical user interface are provided from processing facility 60, preferably as HTML coded Web pages (see col. 6, lines 61-63 and see Fig. 8C), comprising:

A display is taught by Tokin as the technique of window 360 includes field 362 which allows a user to designate what type of new component he would like to create (see col. 7 line 67 to col. 8 line 2);

Page representations located on said display and operative to represent each of a pages of a document to be produced by said production printer, at least one of said page representations characterized by the applicability of at least one ordered media attribute is taught by Tokin as the technique of fields 382 and 384 of Document Builder (see Fig. 5D) wherein the attributes for each production component object describes physical properties of the component and also includes image of the component (see col. 9, lines 14-16) of various pages of the graphical user interface are provided from processing facility 60, preferably as HTML coded Web pages (see col. 6, lines 61-63 and see Fig. 8C), said page representations being thumbnails or miniature images of particular pages, and wherein said display displays more than one page representation simultaneously is taught by Tokin as the technique of Fig. 8c wherein from this position the user can click on either the left displayed page 650 to turn back one page or the right displayed page 652 to advance one page in the document (see page 12, lines 54-56 and see Fig. 8C) and **the miniature image C70 of the front cover 630 is displayed**, together with an image of the selected binder 632 and the miniature tab 634 on the tab page included in the document (see col. 12, lines 28-31), **by clicking on the image of the front cover** advance to a view of the document as though a single page had been turned in the document (see col. 12, lines 37-39).

An attributes representation associated with said at least one ordered media attribute and located on said display is taught by Tokin as the technique of attribute page number 1 through 5 of field 382 through field 384 (see Fig. 5D), and wherein said attribute representation is operatively coupled by selecting said attribute representation for adding, deleting or modifying said ordered media attribute of that page is taught by Tokin as the technique of composition portion of editing window 310 provides a list 326 of the other document components which have

been designated for inclusion within the document, and includes button 328 to add new components, button 330 to remove components, and button 332 to edit a component (see col. 7, lines 57-62) or a user can specify new component, remove components, or edit the description of existing components until he is satisfied with the composition of the document (see col. 8, lines 37-40) and a document creation window is displayed, information is input specifying the arrangement of the document (see col. 6, lines 26-27) by the graphical user interface displayed on a computer monitor to allow a user to create a document and then input and modify the document specification for creating the document (see col. 6, lines 52-55).

Tokin, however, does not disclose the limitation of a symbolic representation operative to visually indicative on said display applicable of said at least one ordered media attribute to said page representation.

Parker discloses the limitation of a symbolic representation operative to visually indicative on said display applicable of said at least one ordered media attribute to said page representation as the technique of a pointer reference with a **symbol defined in the PEF file**. The PDF file can define the appearance with a pointer to a page in the PDF file (see col. 7, lines 54-60).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Parker's symbol defined reference into that of Tokin invention. By doing so, the system would be enhanced by capable of providing pointer for capable of defining the appearance to the particular pages in the PDF file.

As per claim 39 (GUI), due to the mostly similarity of this claim to that of claim 1, the limitation of an ordered media attributes operator interface operatively coupled to each of the one

or more pages for viewing and/or adding, deleting or modifying the ordered media attributes of one or more pages is taught by Tokin as the technique of printed pages editing window 380 includes field 382 and 384 for specifying a range of pages from the source file to be printed. In addition, printed pages editing window 380 includes fields 386, 388, and 390 for specifying the media type on which to printing the specified pages (see col. 8, lines 11-14), the attribute values for each such sub-object have been supplied by the user via the graphical user interface (see col. 8, lines 66-67) for viewing pages (see Fig. 8C), button 328 to add new components, button 330 to remove components, and button 332 to edit a component (see col. 7, lines 60-62), and the user can then modify that information as desired (see col. 7, lines 8-9). This claim is therefore rejected for the reasons as set forth above.

As per claim 40, due to the similarity of this claim to that of claim 39 except for a method instead of a graphical user interface, this claim is therefore rejected for the same reasons applied to claim 39.

As per claims 2 (system) and 21 (method), the limitation of at least one media attribute comprises tab type is taught by Tokin as the technique of tab type: Projects and Add Document (see Fig. 5A), Document Builder and Document Composition (see Fig. 5B). These claims are therefore rejected for the reasons as set forth above.

As per claims 4 (system) and 23 (method), the limitation of media attribute comprises media size is taught by Tokin as the technique of Size (x,y) (see Fig. 6). These claims are therefore rejected for the reason as set forth above.

As per claims 5 (system) and 24 (method), the limitation of media size comprises a value specifying 8.5 * 11 is taught by Tokin as the technique of use size from source file: 8.5 * 11 (see Fig. 5F). These claims are therefore rejected for the reason as set forth above.

5. Claims 3, 6-9, 11-12, 15-17, 25-28, 30-31 and 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants submitted IDS issued to Tokin et al. (USPN: 6,134,568) hereinafter Tokin in view of Parker et al. (USPN: 6,441,919) hereinafter Parker and further in view of Hube (USPN: 5,337,161).

As per claims 3 (system) and 22(method), Tokin-Parker discloses the invention substantially as claimed above. Tokin-Parker, however, does not disclose the limitation of tab type comprises a value specifying cut tabs.

Hube discloses the limitation of tab type comprises a value specifying cut tabs as the technique of cut tab stock (see col.7, line 37) and modulus 5 and 3 of tab parameter type (see col. 7 line 57 to col. 8 line 12).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Hube's value of cut tabs type into that of Tokin-Parker combined invention. By doing do, the system would be enhanced by allowing user to define a specify value of tab cut type.

As per claim 20, Tokin-Parker discloses the invention substantially as claimed above. Tokin-Parker, however, does not disclose the limitation of displaying a symbolic representation of a tab cut in relation to said page representation according to media attribute.

Hube discloses the limitation of displaying a symbolic representation of a tab cut in relation to said page representation according to media attribute as the technique of tabs representation for Overview, H/W, Input, Futures, and Appendix (see Fig. 17).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Hube's tabs representation of tab cut type into that of Tokin-Parker combined invention. By doing do, the system would be enhanced by allowing user easy to define a specify type of tab type.

As per claims 6 (system) and 25 (method), Tokin-Parker discloses the invention substantially as claimed above. Tokin-Parker, however, does not disclose the limitation of numbers of tab cuts.

Hube discloses the limitation of numbers of tab cuts as the technique of numbers of tab cuts of Overview, H/W, Input, Futures, and Appendix (see Fig. 17).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Hube's numbers of tab cuts representation of tab cut types into that of Tokin-Parker combined invention. By doing do, the system would be enhanced by allowing user easy to define a specify type of tab type.

As per claims 7 (system) and 26 (method), Tokin-Parker discloses the invention substantially as claimed above. Tokin-Parker, however, does not disclose the limitation of number of tab cuts comprises number of tab pages in an ordered tab set.

Hube discloses the limitation of number of tab cuts comprises number of tab pages in an ordered tab set as the technique of a set of tab set of tabs of Overview, H/W, Input, Futures, and Appendix corresponds to Table of Content (see Fig. 17).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Hube's number of tab cuts comprises number of tab pages in an ordered tab set into that of Tokin-Parker combined invention. By doing so, the system would be enhanced by allowing user easy to define a specify type of tab type.

As per claims 8 (system) and 27 (method), Tokin-Parker discloses the invention substantially as claimed above. Tokin-Parker, however, does not disclose the limitation of media attribute comprises tab orientation.

Hube discloses the limitation of media attribute comprises tab orientation as the technique of prompting user to select tab's final orientation from menu (see Fig. 11).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Hube's media attribute comprises tab orientation into that of Tokin-Parker combined invention. By doing so, the system would be enhanced by allowing user finalize tab orientation from menu selection.

As per claims 9 (system) and 28 (method), Tokin-Parker discloses the invention substantially as claimed above. Tokin-Parker, however, does not disclose the limitation of total number of tabs separators pages in said document.

Hube discloses the limitation of total number of tabs separators pages in said document as the technique of total number of five tabs namely Overview, H/W, Input, Futures, and Appendix separate pages in said document (see Fig. 17).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Hube's total number of tabs separators pages in said document into that of Tokin-Parker combined invention. By doing do, the system would be enhanced by allowing user easy to define an interesting topic in a document.

As per claims 11 (system) and 30 (method), Tokin-Parker discloses the invention substantially as claimed above. Tokin-Parker, however, does not disclose the limitation of tab left indent.

Hube discloses the limitation of tab left indent as the technique of Prompt User to Select Upper-left Corner of Tab Image using left mouse button (see Fig. 12).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Hube's left indent by using left button into that of Tokin-Parker combined invention. By doing do, the system would be enhanced by allowing user easy to perform left indent of tab document.

As per claims 12 (system) and 31 (method), Tokin-Parker discloses the invention substantially as claimed above. Tokin-Parker, however, does not disclose the limitation of tab right indent.

Hube discloses the limitation of tab right indent as the technique of Prompt User to Select Lower-right Corner of Tab Image using right mouse button (see Fig. 12).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Hube's right indent by using right button into that of Tokin-Parker combined invention. By doing do, the system would be enhanced by allowing user easy to perform right indent of tab document.

As per claims 15 (system) and 34 (method), Tokin-Parker discloses the invention substantially as claimed above. Tokin-Parker, however, does not disclose the limitation of tab label value.

Hube discloses the limitation of tab label value as the technique of text string tab label (see Fig. 18).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Hube's tab label value in term of text string into that of Tokin-Parker combined invention. By doing do, the system would be enhanced by allowing user easy to edit text value to tab document.

As per claims 16 (system) and 35 (method), Tokin-Parker discloses the invention substantially as claimed above. Tokin-Parker, however, does not disclose the limitation of visually indicative on said display tab label value and a formatting of tab label value as it appears when printing on said production printing visually indicative on said display tab label value and a formatting of tab label value as it appears when printing on said production printing.

Hube discloses the limitation of visually indicative on said display tab label value and a formatting of tab label value as it appears when printing on said production printing as the technique of user interface 52 (see col. 5, line 30) for displaying tabs labels strings on a document (see Fig. 17), and the production of tab images by selecting from a supply of image data the image desired for printing on the tab portion of tab stock. The extracted tab image is transformed in accordance with the dimensions and orientation of the tab and requirement of the user (see col. 3, lines 1-6).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Hube's visually indicative on said display tab label value and a formatting of tab label value as it appears when printing on said production printing into that of Tokin-Parker combined invention. By doing do, the system would be enhanced by allowing user easy to edit text value to tab document.

As per claims 17 (system) and 36 (method), Tokin-Parker discloses the invention substantially as claimed above. Tokin-Parker, however, does not disclose the limitation of allows a user to modify one or more media attribute.

Hube discloses the limitation of allows a user to modify one or more media attribute as the technique of capability of editing the tab sequence (see col. 3, lines 8-9).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Hube's allows a user to edit and/or modify one or more media attribute into that of Tokin-Parker combined invention. By doing do, the system would be enhanced by allowing user easy to edit text value to tab document.

6. Claims 10 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants submitted IDS issued to Tokin et al. (USPN: 6,134,568) hereinafter Tokin in view of Parker et al. (USPN: 6,441,919) hereinafter Parker and further in view of Lodwick et al. (USPN: 6,226,419).

As per claims 10 (system) and 29 (method), Tokin-Parker discloses the invention substantially as claimed above. Tokin-Parker, however, does not disclose the limitation of edge offset.

Lodwick discloses the limitation of edge offset as the technique of horizontal X and vertical Y calibration offsets are calculated based on the respective errors of the positions of the vertical and horizontal margin lines (see col. 9, lines 32-36).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Lodwick's edge offset into that of Tokin-Parker combined invention. By doing do, the system would be enhanced by providing detail information to an end user. Thus, allowing user easy to define an interesting topic in a document.

7. Claims 13-14 and 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants submitted IDS issued to Tokin et al. (USPN: 6,134,568) hereinafter Tokin in view of Parker et al. (USPN: 6,441,919) hereinafter Parker and further in view of Lunt (USPN: 6,543,046).

As per claims 13 (system) and 32 (method), Tokin-Parker discloses the invention substantially as claimed above. Tokin-Parker, however, does not disclose the limitation of media attribute comprises tab output order.

Lunt discloses the limitation of tab output order as the technique of indexed tabs (see col. 4, line 18).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Lunt tab output order into that of Tokin-Parker combined invention. By doing so, the system would be enhanced by providing tab index order to an end user.

As per claims 14 (system) and 33 (method), Tokin-Parker discloses the invention substantially as claimed above. Tokin-Parker, however, does not disclose the limitation of a value specifying first-tab-first or last-tab-first.

Lunt discloses the limitation of a value specifying first-tab-first or last-tab-first as the technique of while the hierarchical grouping of attributes on a business object is often a useful representation, the user may want to find an attribute directly, without considering where it exists in the interface. A navigation index addresses the need to support both conflicting navigational strategies, which displayed all of the attributes in a list in alphabetical order or some other order. By selecting the attribute and then selecting a “Go to” button, the appropriate attribute is highlighted, regardless of what tab it appears on (see col. 7, lines 22-33).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Lunt specifying first-tab-first or last-tab-first in term of selecting the attribute and then selecting a “Go to” button, the appropriate attribute is highlighted, regardless of what tab it appears on into that of Tokin-Parker combined invention. By doing so, the system would be enhanced by easy navigation tools to an end user.

8. Claims 18 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants submitted IDS issued to Tokin et al. (USPN: 6,134,568) hereinafter Tokin in view of Parker et al. (USPN: 6,441,919) and Hube (USPN: 5,337,161) and further in view of Kanevsky et al. (USPN: 6,426,761) hereinafter Kanevsky.

As per claims 18 (system) and 37 (method), Tokin-Parker-Hube discloses the invention substantially as claimed above. Tokin-Parker-Hube, however, does not discloses the further limitation of comprising a user input device to allow a user to specify at least one frequently used configuration of the at least one media attribute, wherein said interface is further operative to generate at least one value of said at least one media attribute based on said specified at least one frequently used configuration.

Kanevsky discloses the limitation of a user input device to allow a user to specify at least one frequently used configuration of the at least one media attribute, wherein said interface is further operative to generate at least one value of said at least one media attribute based on said specified at least one frequently used configuration as the technique of the icon size, brightness and nesting determination may be based on the creation date, hierarchical, frequency of use, size of information representation by the icon, relations between information represented by the icon... a user wish to place more frequently used icons in a central position with larger size (see col. 4, lines 43-52), if all the icons in a cluster have not been used for a long time, the fractal dimension of the cluster may automatically change which gives the cluster a different, smaller appearance to the user and potentially free-up screen real-estate for other icons in the cluster that are more frequently used. The feature of automatically determination of cluster characteristic, for

example, the depth of a sub-icon in relation to its cluster may be determined according to the criteria, e.g., recency of use, frequency of use, etc. (see col. 7, lines 16-25).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Kanevsky's limitations of one frequently used configuration of the at least one media attribute, wherein said interface is further operative to automatically generate at least one media attribute based on said specified at least one frequently used configuration into that of Tokin-Parker-Hube combined invention. By doing do, the system would be enhanced by automatically freezing up screen estate of never used icon attribute in order to maximizing the size of frequently used icon attribute configuration. Thus, the system would provide better tools of screen estate to an end user.

9. Applicants arguments filed on January 07, 2005 have been fully reconsidered, but they are not persuasive.

On the second paragraph of page 8, Applicants argue that "Tokin and Parker fail to suggest any motivation for, or desirability of, the changes espoused. Here, hindsight is relied upon to arrive at the determination of obviousness". The Examiner, however, does not agree to this statement regarding to motivation since as indicated by the Examiner that "Tokin does not disclose the limitation of a **symbolic representation** operative to visually indicative on said display applicable of said at least one ordered media attribute to said page representation.

Parker discloses the limitation of a **symbolic representation** operative to visually indicative on said display applicable of said at least one ordered media attribute to said page representation as the technique of a pointer reference with a symbol defined in the PEF file.

The PDF file can define the appearance with a pointer to a page in the PDF file (see col. 7, lines 54-60).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Parker's symbol defined reference into that of Tokin invention. By doing do, the system would be enhanced by capable of providing pointer for capable of defining the appearance to the particular pages in the PDF file.

As points out by Parker that “the PDF file can define the appearance with a pointer to a page in the PDF file or, for objects that are render quickly, the appearance can be defined by PDF objects in the PDF file. The pointer can be expressed as a file name with a page number, or as a file name with a symbolic reference with a symbol defined in the PDF file. The PDF file that has the object can store in it a variety of ways, such as by using OPI or by using a PDF external stream to store the actual object data (col. 7, lines 53-62).

On the second paragraph of page 9, Applicants argue that “Specially, it is respectfully submitted that neither Tokin or Parker either singularly or in combination disclose or suggest:

- a) attribute representations operatively coupled by selecting them for adding, deleting or modifying ordered media attribute of a page;
- b) symbolic representations of ordered media attribute operatively coupled by selecting the symbolic representations for adding, deleting or modifying ordered media attribute of that page;
- c) ordered media attribute representations coupled with page representations which operative to symbolically represent one ordered media attributes on a page representation, and

wherein the ordered media attribute is operatively coupled by selecting it for adding, deleting or modifying ordered media attribute of that page;

- d) providing operative coupling ordered media attributes for each of the pages for viewing and/or adding, deleting or modifying the ordered media attributes of the pages by selecting the representations coupled with the page; or
- e) operative coupling to an ordered media attributes operator interface available for each page for viewing and/or adding, deleting or modifying the ordered media attributes of the pages by selecting the page representation for the pages".

The Examiner, however, do not agree to items a-e for the following reasons:

Regarding to item a), the limitation of "attribute representations operatively coupled by selecting them for adding, deleting or modifying ordered media attribute of a page" is taught by Tokin as the technique of **attribute page number 1 through 5 of field 382 through field 384 (see Fig. 5D) wherein a user can specify new component, remove components, or edit the description of existing components until he is satisfied with the composition of the document (see col. 8, lines 37-40).**

Regarding to item b), the limitation "symbolic representations of ordered media attribute operatively coupled by selecting the symbolic representations for adding, deleting or modifying ordered media attribute of that page", as indicated by the Examiner in the previous Office Action that "Parker discloses the limitation of a symbolic representation operative to visually indicative on said display applicable of said at least one ordered media attribute to said page representation

as the technique of a pointer reference with **a symbol defined in the PEF file**. The PDF file can define the appearance with a pointer to a page in the PDF file (see col. 7, lines 54-60).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Paker's symbol defined reference into that of Tokin invention. By doing do, the system would be enhanced by capable of providing pointer for capable of defining the appearance to the particular pages in the PDF file. ”.

Regarding to item c), the limitation of “ordered media attribute representations coupled with page representations represent one ordered media attributes on a page representation, and wherein the ordered media attribute is operatively coupled by selecting it for adding, deleting or modifying ordered media attribute of that page” is taught by Tokin as the technique of fields 382 and 384 of Document Builder (see Fig. 5D) wherein the **attributes for each production component object describes physical properties of the component and also includes image of the component (see col. 9, lines 14-16) of various pages of the graphical user interface are provided from processing facility 60, preferably as HTML coded Web pages** (see col. 6, lines 61-63 and see Fig. 8C),

Tokin, however, does not disclose the limitation of symbolic representations of ordered media attribute operatively coupled by selecting the symbolic representations for adding, deleting or modifying ordered media attribute of that page.

Parker, on the other hand, discloses the limitation of symbolic representations of ordered media attribute operatively coupled by selecting the symbolic representations for adding, deleting or modifying ordered media attribute of that page as the technique of a pointer reference

with a symbol defined in the PEF file. The PDF file can define the appearance with a pointer to a page in the PDF file (see col. 7, lines 54-60).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Paker's symbol defined reference into that of Tokin invention. By doing so, the system would be enhanced by capable of providing pointer for capable of defining the appearance to the particular pages in the PDF file. ”.

Regarding to item d) or item e), the limitation of “providing operative coupling ordered media attributes for each of the pages for viewing and/or adding, deleting or modifying the ordered media attributes of the pages by selecting the representations coupled with the page” or “operative coupling to an ordered media attributes operator interface available for each page for viewing and/or adding, deleting or modifying the ordered media attributes of the pages by selecting the page representation for the pages” is taught by Tokin as the technique of **composition portion of editing window 310 provides a list 326 of the other document components which have been designated for inclusion within the document, and includes button 328 to add new components, button 330 to remove components, and button 332 to edit a component (see col. 7, lines 57-62 and see Fig. 5B).**

On the last paragraph of page 9, Applicants argue that “ This is not operative coupling for editing the attributes associated with those pages. In order to add, delete or modify the attributes shown in those figures, the user must “ proceed to step 254 to display the main document editing window”. The Examiner, however, does not agree to this argument since Tokin discloses the

limitation of “operative coupling for editing the attributes associated with those pages. In order to add, delete or modify pages’ attributes” as the technique of composition portion of editing window 310 provides a list 326 of the other document components which have been designated for inclusion within the document, and includes button 328 to add new components, button 330 to remove components, and button 332 to edit a component (see col. 7, lines 57-62 and see Fig. 5B).

On the first and second paragraphs of page 10, Applicants argue that “Claims 3, 6-9, 11-12, 15-17, 25-28, 30-31, and 34-36 are rejected as being obvious over Tokin in view of Parker, and further in view of Hube. As the Applicant’s have demonstrated, a combination of Tokin and Parker et al. does not render the claimed invention obvious because of the lack of motivation in either of these references to make the combination and the additional claimed features which are not taught or suggested in either of the references”. The Examiner, however, does not agree to this argument since as indicated by the Examiner in above section that:

Tokin does not disclose the limitation of a **symbolic representation** operative to visually indicative on said display applicable of said at least one ordered media attribute to said page representation.

Parker discloses the limitation of a **symbolic representation** operative to visually indicative on said display applicable of said at least one ordered media attribute to said page representation as the technique of a pointer reference with a symbol defined in the PEF file. The PDF file can define the appearance with a pointer to a page in the PDF file (see col. 7, lines 54-60).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Paker's symbol defined reference into that of Tokin invention. By doing do, the system would be enhanced by capable of providing pointer for capable of defining the appearance to the particular pages in the PDF file.

Further as points out by Parker that “the PDF file can define the appearance with a pointer to a page in the PDF file or, for objects that are render quickly, the appearance can be defined by PDF objects in the PDF file. The pointer can be expressed as a file name with a page number, or as a file name with a symbolic reference with a symbol defined in the PDF file. The PDF file that has the object can store in it a variety of ways, such as by using OPI or by using a PDF external stream to store the actual object data (col. 7, lines 53-62).

On the third and fourth paragraphs of page 10, Applicants argue that “With regard to the term “pointer”, the Examiner quotes from Parker: “ The PDF file can define the appearance with a pointer to a page in the PDF file (see col. 7, lines 54-60).”. The Examiner then explains: “ The pointer reference personalized multiple pages in term of graphical objects. In an object based, the PDF file is made up of discrete page units that can be processed separately, and that the appearance of the object on a display output can be computed without knowledge of the appearance of a previous page or any other page. Thus, that page can be rendered independently of each other and in parallel. This, in turn, supports shared objects and has an efficient structure for referencing and retrieving them. It not only contains graphical objects, but it also contains information describing the attributes and the placement of the graphical objects in the

document.”. Applicant’s can not find such an explanation in Parker”. The Examiner agrees to this argument and for more clarification, see Parker, col. 5, lines 52-64.

On the last paragraph of page 10, Applicants argue that “ In the present application, it is explained the “displayed pointer is manipulated over a particular thumbnail image”. This is not a pointer expressed as a file name or symbol defined in the PDF file as described in Parker. The pointer referred to in Parker is not described or taught as a visual representation on a user interface for “pointing” to representations on the user interface.”. The Examiner, however, does not agree to this argument since as indicated by the Examiner that Tokin discloses, not Parker, page representations being thumbnails **or miniature images of particular pages**, and wherein said display displays more than one page representation simultaneously is taught by Tokin as the technique of in Fig. 8A, **the miniature image C70 of the front cover 630 is displayed**, together with an image of the selected binder 632 and the miniature tab 634 on the tab page included in the document (see col. 12, lines 28-31) and **by clicking on the image of the front cover** advance to a view of the document as though a single page had been turned in the document (see col. 12, lines 37-39). Thus, **an end user, in turn, would be controlled by placing a pointer over the miniature image of the front cover for manipulating the document.**

Conclusion

10. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. A shortened statutory period for reply to this action is set to expire THREE MONTHS, ZERO DAYS from the mailing date of this action. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to be abandoned.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CUONG T THAI whose telephone number is (571) 272-4056. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am - 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W. Cabeca can be reached on (571) 272-4048. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CUONG T THAI
Examiner
Art Unit 2173

May 25, 2005.

JOHN CABECA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100